

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 8, 2002 LB 752

with a number of small things scattered throughout the amendment that are currently in front of you right now, and I will go over them in just a second. And then the second part of the divided amendment will be Section 2 of Senator Chambers' amendment, if you have that before you, AM2443, which deals exclusively with the idea of the pretrial hearing that would allow or not allow...which would be the basis for allowing or not allowing an informant to testify at the actual trial. So we will take that up later. Right now what this part of the amendment does, first of all it goes into the findings and declaration section of Senator Chambers' amendment, which is now the bill, and in line 4, where we say, the Legislature finds and declares that the interests of justice are thwarted by unreliable testimony at trial, it softens it to say, may be thwarted. Down in the second paragraph, line 9, where it says, the Legislature further finds and declares that the testimony of a jailhouse informer is inherently unreliable, we soften that to say, is sometimes unreliable. In line 11, the sentence begins, a jailhouse informer, due to the receipt or promise of a benefit, is presumed to provide testimony that is unreliable, that is also softened to say may be unreliable. So the whole effect of the first three parts of the amendment are to soften the language in the findings section. And then there are a couple of pages on...a couple of changes on the second page of Senator Chambers' amendment, on line 8 of subsection(4), which used to say, all known cases where a jailhouse informer testified or offered statements against a person, this is...this subsection is part of the provision that requires notice to the defendant ten days ahead of time of certain specific information that's set out, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, on pages 1 and 2. One of those pieces of information has to do with the jailhouse informer's former testimony or statements in cases, and so we're changing it from all known cases to all cases known to the state, with the idea of making the state responsible for revealing what they know, not responsible for cases that may be known to somebody out in society somewhere. So it further...it limits the scope of that requirement. And then the only other substantive change was the striking of subsection (6) in that same framework, which required any other information relevant to the jailhouse informer's credibility, which sounds all right on the surface, but it puts the burden on the prosecutor to decide what's